

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-6206

DARRELL J. WILLIAMS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

WILLIAM D. CATOE, Director of SCDC; CHARLES M.
CONDON, Attorney General of the State of South
Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 03-7621

DARRELL J. WILLIAMS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

WILLIAM D. CATOE, Director of SCDC; CHARLES M.
CONDON, Attorney General of the State of South
Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Florence. C. Weston Houck, Senior District
Judge. (CA-00-265-4-12)

Submitted: February 9, 2004

Decided: March 8, 2004

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Darrell J. Williams, Appellant Pro Se. Derrick K. McFarland,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Columbia, South
Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Darrell J. Williams, a state prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his motion filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000), and on postjudgment motions. A final order in a habeas proceeding is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Williams has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeals. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED